

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 10, 2010, in which claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-26 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 15, 18 and 19 are amended. Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-26 remain pending in the present application.

### **Interview Summary**

The Applicant thanks Examiner Evanisko for his participation in a telephone interview with Brian W. Oberst and Kimberly S Zillig, as Applicant's representatives. The participants discussed amending the claims, as indicated above, to overcome the Section 112 rejections and the objection to the Specification. The participants agreed the claims as listed above overcome the pending rejections and objection.

### **Objection to the Specification**

The Office Action objected to the specification on the grounds of lack of antecedent basis for claimed subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that the specification does not contain the term "helical drive grooves," and that it is unclear as to what the term pertains (Office Action, p. 2).

Without acquiescing to the above Objection, to expedite prosecution of the case, the Applicant has overcome the objection by removing the term "helical drive grooves" from the claims by the amendments indicated above. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

### **Section 112 Rejections**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that the term "helical drive grooves," the phrase "by the piston and having one or more helical drive grooves forming a drive mechanism..." and the phrase "partially recessed within the piston with a portion ... above an outer surface of the piston" are vague (Office Action, pp. 2-3). Also, the term "the recess" in claims 3, 4, 5 and 11 is said to lack antecedent basis (Office Action, p. 3).

The Office Action further rejected claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Particularly, the rejection relates to use of the term “helical drive grooves” (Office Action, p. 4).

The Applicant respectfully believes that the claims as previously presented fully satisfied the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Nevertheless, without acquiescing to the rejections, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 15 and 19 to expedite prosecution of the case. Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-26 as listed above fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons explained above, all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowance.

Any amendments to the claims are made to expedite prosecution of this application, without acquiescing to the Office’s rejections or characterizations of the claims or references in the Office Action. Even if not expressly discussed above, the Applicant respectfully traverses each of the rejections, assertions, and characterizations regarding the disclosure and teachings of the cited references, including the prior art status and the propriety of proposed combinations of cited references.

The Applicant has made a good faith effort to respond to all rejections set forth in the Office Action and to place the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. If it would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

Dated: September 23, 2010

By: /Brian W. Oberst reg. no. 52079/  
Brian W. Oberst  
Reg. No. 52,079  
612-766-7174  
Customer No.: 42074